

REMARKS

Reconsideration and further prosecution of the above-identified application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and discussion that follows. Claims 1-26 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2, 8, 11-12, 18, 21 and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,721,416 to Farrell. After a careful review of the claims, and in view of the amendments to the claims, the rejections are therefore traversed and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 11 and 21 have been further limited to “providing a plurality of auxiliary scripts at least some of which may be concatenated to form the predetermined storyline . . . following a script of the plurality of scripts associated with the selected expected customer response of the customer as the second concatenated portion of the presented script of the predetermined storyline”. Support for the additional limitation may be found within the specification on page 5, lines 6-20.

In contrast, Farrell is directed to a “word table 64 . . . having four fields . . . The first field contains the text of the confrontational statement or phrase. The second field contains the text of a non-confrontational alternative . . . The third field contains the text of a non-confrontational counter phrase” and “A counter statement . . . the system suggests if it detects that the caller has made a confrontational statement” (Farrell, col. 4, lines 41-62). Since Farrell merely suggests non-confrontational counter phrases, Farrell fails to provide any teaching with regard to storylines or to the concatenation of scripts to form a predetermined storyline.

Since Farrell fails to teach of these particular claim elements, Farrell does not do the same or any similar thing as that of the claimed invention. Since Farrell does not do the same or any similar thing as that of the claimed invention, the rejections are now improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 9-10, 19-20 and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farrell. Regarding claims 9, 10, 19, 20 and 25, the claims depend on allowable base claims, and add additional, novel subject matter of the invention. For this reason, Applicant's claims 9, 10, 19, 20 and 25 are believed to be allowable.

Claims 3-5, 13-15 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farrell in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,567,787 to Walker et al. However, Walker et al. (as with Farrell) fails to provide any teaching or suggestion of the method step of (or apparatus for) "providing a plurality of auxiliary scripts at least some of which may be concatenated to form the predetermined storyline" or of "following a script of the plurality of scripts associated with the selected expected customer response of the customer as a second concatenated portion of the presented script of the predetermined storyline".

Since Farrell and Walker et al. fails to teach or suggest these claim elements, the combination fails to teach each and every claim element. Since the combination fails to teach each and every claim element, the rejection is believed to be improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 6-7, 16-17 and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Farrell in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,313,833 to Knight. However, Knight (as with Farrell) fails to provide any teaching or suggestion of the method step of (or apparatus for) "providing a plurality of auxiliary scripts at least some of which may be concatenated to form the predetermined storyline" or of "following a script of the plurality of scripts associated with the selected expected customer response of the customer as a second concatenated portion of the presented script of the predetermined storyline".

Since Farrell and Knight fails to teach or suggest these claim elements, the combination fails to teach each and every claim element. Since the combination fails to teach each and every claim element, the rejection is believed to be improper and should be withdrawn.

Allowance of claims 1-26, as now presented, is believed to be in order and such action is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, he is respectfully requested to telephone applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.

By 
Jon P. Christensen
Registration No. 34,137

March 4, 2005
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.
120 South Riverside Plaza
22nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 655-1500